TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY OPIGINAL

In the Matter of:

Maritime Communications/Land Mobile, LLC

EB Docket No. 11-71

RECEIVED

ZOII NOV -4 P 2:43

ORIGINAL

DATE OF HEARING: October 25, 2011 VOLUME: 2

PLACE OF HEARING: __WASHINGTON, D.C. __ PAGES: __116-296_

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC. 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 TELEPHONE (202) 234-4433

Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of MARITIME COMMUNICATIONS/LAND MOBILE, LLC Participant in Auction No. 61 and Licensee of Various Authorizations in the Wireless Radio Services Applicant for Modification of Various Authorization in the Wireless Radio Services Applicant with ENCANA OIL AND GAS (USA),) 0004507921, 0004153701 INC.; DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY, DCP MIDSTREAM, LP; JACKSON COUNTY RURAL MEMBERSHIP ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE; PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.; ENBRIDGE ENERGY COMPANY, INC.; INTERSTATE POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY; WISCONSIN POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY; DIXIE ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION, INC.; ATLAS PIPELINE-MID CONTINENT, LLC.; DENTON COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., DBA COSERV ELECTRIC; AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY For Commission Consent to the Assignment) of Various Authorizations in Wireless Radio Service Tuesday,

October 25, 2011

Volume 2

Hearing Room A 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE JUDGE RICHARD L. SIPPEL Chief Administrative Law Judge

) EB Docket No. 11-71

) File No. EB-09-IH-1751) FRN: 0013587779

) Application File Nos.) 0004030479, 0004144435) 0004193028, 0004193328) 0004354053, 0004309872) 0004310060, 0004314903) 0004315013, 0004430505) 0004417199, 0004419431) 0004422320, 0004422329) 0004526264, 0004636537 and 0004604962

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Federal Communications Commission:

PAMELA S. KANE, ESQ.
Deputy Chief
BRAIN J. CARTER, ESQ.
Investigations & Hearings Division
Enforcement Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554
(202) 418-2393

On Behalf of the Licensee, Maritime Communications/Land Mobile, LLC:

BOB KELLER, ESQ.
Law Offices of Robert J. Keller, P.C.
1850 M Street, N.W.
Suite 240
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 223-2100

CRAIG M. GENO, ESQ.
Harris Jernigan & Geno, PLLC
587 Highland Colony Parkway
Post Office Box 3380
Ridgeland, MS 39158-3380
(601) 427-0048

On Behalf of the Petitioners, Warren C. Havens; Environmental, LLC; Intelligent Transportation and Monitoring Wireless, LLC.; Skybridge Spectrum Foundation; Telesaurus Holdings GB, LLC; Verde Systems, LLC; and V2G LLC:

KRISTIN K. GOING, ESQ.
PATRICK R. McFADDEN, ESQ.
Drinker Biddle & Reath, LLP
1500 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005-1209
(202) 230-5177
(202) 354-1330

On Behalf of the Applicants, Atlas Pipeline Mid-Continent, LLC; DCP Midstream, LP; Enbridge Energy Company, Inc.; Encana Oil & Gas (USA) Inc.; and Jackson County Rural Electric Membership Corporation:

JACK RICHARDS, ESQ.
WESLEY K. WRIGHT, ESQ.
Keller and Heckman, LLP
1001 G Street, N.W.
Suite 500 West
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-4210

On Behalf of the Applicant, Denton County Electric Cooperative, Inc.:

ROBERT J. MILLER, ESQ.
Gardere Wynne Sewell, LLP
3000 Thanksgiving Tower
1601 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761
(214) 999-3000

On Behalf of the Applicant, Dixie Electric Membership Corporation, Inc.:

MATTHEW J. PLACHE, ESQ. Catalano & Plache, PLLC 3221 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007 (202) 338-3200

On Behalf of the Applicants, Interstate Power & Light Company and Wisconsin Power & Light Company:

KURT E. DeSOTO, ESQ.
JOSHUA S. TURNER, ESQ.
Wiley Rein, LLP
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 719-7235

On Behalf of the Applicant, Southern California Regional Rail Authority:

HARRY F. COLE, ESQ. Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, PLC 11th Floor 1300 North 17th Street Arlington, Virginia 22209 (703) 812-04823

On Behalf of the Applicant, Puget Sound Energy Inc.:

JEFFREY L. SHELDON, ESQ. Fish & Richardson, P.C. 1425 K Street, N.W. 11th Floor Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 783-5070

NEAL R. GROSS

On Behalf of the Applicant, Duquesne Light Company:

CHARLES A. ZDEBSKI, ESQ. Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. 12th Floor Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 659-6605

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(10:00 a.m.)
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is the
4	conference in the maritime proceeding,
5	Docket Number, EB Docket 11-71. It's the
6	25th of October and this conference is being
7	held pursuant to my order.
8	I'm going to be, what happened is
9	I had my thoughts all outlined very clearly
10	in a notebook, not in a notebook, rather,
11	but a notepad, which I left dutifully on my
12	kitchen table, so, and it wasn't because I
13	got distracted by the game, I just forgot
14	it.
15	So I'm going to start by taking -
16	- let's get appearances on the record. This
17	is quite a show this morning, but we've, we
18	actually all have been together before. So
19	let's start with the Bureau.
20	MS. KANE: Pamela Kane, for the
21	Enforcement Bureau.
	TIPOR CIPPRI Olean Ma Vana

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, Ms. Kane.

1	Good morning. And for Maritime.
2	MR. KELLER: Robert Keller and
3	Craig Geno, bankruptcy counsel for Maritime
4	Equipment as well.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, what Mr.,
6	I'm sorry, Geno?
7	MR. GENO: Geno, yes, sir. Good
8	morning, Your Honor.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Good morning.
10	What city or town or whatnot are you from?
11	MR. GENO: Jackson, Mississippi.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Jackson,
13	Mississippi. Haven't had a lawyer from
14	Jackson, Mississippi in I don't know how
15	long. If you believe that. Okay, welcome.
16	MR. GENO: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: And for Havens?
18	MR. MCFADDEN: Good morning, Your
19	Honor. JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr.
20	Havens?
21	MR. MCFADDEN: Good morning, Your
22	Honor. Patrick McFadden.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. McFadden.
2	MR. MCFADDEN: Attorneys for
3	SkyTel, and with me is Kristin Going.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Kristin Going?
5	MS. GOING: Yes, Your Honor.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Good morning,
7	ma'am.
8	MS. GOING: Good morning.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, and then,
10	why don't we start, I guess with the order
11	of the people, it it doesn't really make
12	any difference, the particular order, the
13	people who are seated, the applicant
14	parties.
15	MR. RICHARDS: Your Honor, Jack
16	Richards and Wes Wright from Keller and
17	Heckman on behalf of Encana Oil and Gas,
18	which is the first listed applicant. But if
19	I may also, Atlas Pipeline-Mid Continent,
20	LLC., Enbridge Energy Company, Inc., Jackson
21	County Rural Electric Membership
	I and the second

Corporation, and lastly, DCP Midstream, LP,

1	which is a party, for the time being, that
2	have a pending motion to withdraw.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Fine. Thank you.
4	Thank you, sir. And who's the next on the
5	list?
6	MR. PLACHE: Matthew Plache with
7	Catalano & Plache, on behalf of Dixie
8	Electric Membership Corporation.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: And next?
10	MR. TURNER: Joshua Turner and
11	Kurt DeSoto on behalf of Interstate Power
12	and Light, and Wisconsin Power and Light.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: And?
14	MR. SHELDON: Jeffrey Sheldon
15	from Fish & Richardson on behalf of Puget
16	Sound Energy.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Puget Sound
18	Energy, good. And we have gotten Mr.
19	Havens' representation. And next?
20	MR. ZDEBSKI: Good morning, Your
21	Honor. Charlie Zdebski, on behalf of
22	Duquesne Light Company.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. And?
2	MR. COLE: Your Honor, I'm Harry
3	Cole from Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth on
4	behalf of Southern California Regional Rail
5	Authority.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Cole, why
7	didn't I recognize you?
8	MR. COLE: I kind of
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: You probably don't
10	recognize me anymore.
11	MR. COLE: The years must be the
12	mileage, Your Honor.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: On speaker phone?
14	MR. MILLER: Your Honor, it's
15	Robert Miller and Richard Roberson on behalf
16	of CoServ, and I appreciate your allowing us
17	to participate in this matter.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Glad to have you
19	this morning, Mr. Miller. Okay, that's
20	and you're representing who?
21	MR. MILLER: Denton County
22	Electric Cooperative, Inc., d/b/a CoServ

1	Electric.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Now,
3	everybody here hears you, then. It's coming
4	through loud and clear here on this end, and
5	can you hear me okay?
6	MR. MILLER: We're doing fine,
7	thank you very much.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, let's
9	okay, let's hope it works throughout. We're
10	pretty good at paying our electric bills
11	here, I think. Okay. Let's hear first from
12	the Bureau. We had status reports. They
13	came from two they, well, actually two
14	parties. The Bureau and Mr. Havens. We
15	didn't hear from you, Mr. Keller.
16	MR. KELLER: There's nothing
17	further to report, Your Honor. I mean, we
18	left the status report on anything further
19	that we wanted during discovery. We don't
20	anticipate initiating more discovery, and we
21	have nothing beyond the

JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that the way I

1	worded that order?
2	MR. KELLER: You said what she
3	says in discovery and any other agenda item
4	that you want to discuss in the conference.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what the
6	status of discovery would be, discovery has
7	not moved or it's only moved, and why. But,
8	I mean, I'm going to get that anyway.
9	I'm surprised that you read it
10	that way. Let me see, order are the request
11	to appear via telephone, no, that's not the
12	one. We had you, Mr. Miller. Okay, or this
13	is, this must be that been the order.
14	September 26th order. Okay. Let me see.
15	Pre-hearing conference was scheduled.
16	Further ordered the agenda, talked about the
17	status of bankruptcy proceeding. Doesn't
18	have them there?
19	MR. KELLER: Well, if that's the
20	agenda, we'll discuss then.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I'm sorry.
22	MR. KELLER: The last paragraph says

1	it shall be
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry. It shall
3	be submitted as status report on one. Further
4	discovery needed; and two, any agenda topics
5	desired for conference -
6	(Simultaneous speaking.)
7	MR. KELLER: agenda topics other
8	than the ones you've already set, which is the
9	status of the bankruptcy and the progress in
10	sales.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, maybe I'm losing
12	my touch. I'm not going to beat up on that.
13	I've got two up to date status reports and I'm
14	set to go. So we know where you stand on
15	discovery, Ms. Kane.
16	MS. KANE: Well, Your Honor, we've
17	served discovery and
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I realize that.
19	MS. KANE: as we've outlined very
20	carefully in our status report, we started
21	serving discovery the day after the discovery
22	period opened on July 6th. We served a set of

interrogatories and a set of document requests. 1 2 We have yet to receive responses to those. have a second set outstanding, a second set of 3 interrogatories and document requests, that we 4 served on August 1st, Maritime has not responded 5 6 to those. If you recall, Your Honor ordered 7 them to produce and serve revised request for admissions responses on August 19th. 8 9 not received those. So it's essentially as if discovery has not taken place at all. It hasn't 10 even started in this case at this point. 11 12 have no further information from Maritime, or frankly, from the applicant parties than we had 13 at the beginning of the status conference in 14 15 June. Now, I know what's 16 JUDGE SIPPEL: hanging fire here is the Second Thursday issue, 17 but why didn't you comply with my order to clean 18 19 up those request submissions? MR. KELLER: Well, I filed a pleading 20 on that after they filed their motion to compel. 21

I mean, we were waiting on a ruling on the

motion for stay of all procedural dates, 1 including discovery, and we felt that it's sort 2 of moot to go through discovery when we're going 3 to avoid the hearing due to Second Thursday. 4 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, but that was 5 the, really, the information that you entered, 6 you've already given the information, it's just 7 a question of cleaning it up. I mean, it really 8 9 wasn't that burdensome, and I don't know why you think just filing a motion for relief on Second 10 Thursday, a relatively broad motion on it, at 11 12 that point, was good enough to, you know, clear the deck from at least that part of the 13 discovery. I just don't understand that. 14 MR. KELLER: Well, we can go back and 15 review that, Your Honor, but my point is, really 16 17 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I --18 MR. KELLER: We requested a deferral 19 of all dates, in other words, the idea was to 20 stop proceedings in the hearing, so that we 21 22 could go ahead and concentrate on the Second

Thursday. 1 2 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. 3 MR. KELLER: And discovery, you know, would take a lot of time, energy and money, you 4 know, away from those efforts. 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm not talking 6 about discovery in general. I'm talking --7 MR. KELLER: I understand. 8 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: -- about only one aspect of it, which, where you had already 10 responded to, it was just that it was, it was my 11 12 determination from pleadings that were filed after that, that the answers that you gave were 13 not adequate, and then bingo, nothing more. And 14 I'm not going to, again, beat on this, but I 15 wasn't happy with that development either. 16 I did not intend for all discovery to 17 stop dead in the water, although I was, perhaps, 18 not clear enough in terms of delineating what is 19 going to be required to be done and what could 20 be deferred. Because I understand the 21 significance of your motion, and I don't intend

to have any party do anything that's going to

be, in the final analysis, a waste of time.

I'm just haven't reached that point

yet, where I can be convinced of that. And I

yet, where I can be convinced of that. And I also mean that I have an obligation to rule on your Second Thursday motion. I mean the substantive merits on it.

MR. KELLER: Yes.

JUDGE SIPPEL: My job is to determine whether or not you've shown cause for delaying this proceeding. You can do what you want with the Second Thursday. And what I haven't seen, I haven't seen a clear delineation of facts that show that you're really in a position to get that relief.

For example, do you have any buyers lined up that are ready, willing and able to go forward? Number two, where do the applications of all these parties stand, with respect to that? You can't force them to assign their interests to someone else.

And that, alone, leads me to think

NEAL R. GROSS

1 that the issue is just not set to sit back and 2 say, well we don't have anything more to do in 3 this case, unless Maritime gets turned down by 4 the Commission and has to come back. I'm not 5 there vet. That's what I want to let you know 6 I'm going to hear from you on this, but 7 let me start with the Bureau. 8 Well, Your Honor, at a MS. KANE: 9 minimum, we believe that we should be entitled 10 to discovery that would be relevant to a Second Thursday analysis, much of which we've already 11 asked for in our initial assessment and 12 13 discovery. Information relating to the actual 14 15 contract and the value of the contracts between 16 Maritime and the applicants, for example. 17 Any draft contracts that they may have entered into or negotiated, which would put 18 19 a value on the spectrum at issue in this case. Any valuation that they have of that 20 spectrum or any evaluation they've made of that 21 spectrum. All of this is relevant to a Second 22

Thursday analysis.

In addition, there's a list now in the bankruptcy court of pages and pages of people that they identify as innocent creditors. We should be entitled to determine what the relationship is of those people to the alleged wrong-doers in this hearing.

And several of those are already covered by initial discovery that we asked for in July, several of those individuals.

Any documents that relate to the relationship between Mr. DePriest and Maritime to ascertain whether, in fact, he is an innocent creditor.

This is all discovery that is not only tantamount to the issue for us before this hearing, but are also necessary for a Second Thursday analysis that Maritime believes will be forthcoming. So at a minimum, we would ask for that discovery to move forward.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me, I -now, you've laid that out very clearly, but me

NEAL R. GROSS

just take it one step removed from that. What's your position with respect to the application of Second Thursday?

What do you submit is essential to show, is it a prima facie case that they can qualify for Second Thursday? Is there a reasonable belief of probability before you're prepared to argue that, well, now we should --we're not prepared to delay this case now, or, okay, they've made adequate showing. We agree, this case should be deferred until they get a ruling.

MS. KANE: Well, it's our understand, Your Honor, that Second Thursday is an exception to the long-standing Jefferson Radio policy, and that that exception is only put into play to balance the interest of innocent creditors against the interest of the Commission in determining to whom the licenses should be directed.

Once innocent creditors are paid from the value of Maritime's assets, it is the

Bureau's position that any further assets, any further licenses should not be disposed of through a Second Thursday process, and that it will be inevitable that those licenses must be determined, the qualifications must be determined at a hearing.

The bankruptcy pleadings demonstrate that Maritime's proposed valuation of those licenses is nearly double what is necessary to pay the innocent creditors. And that was the argument we made in our supplemental briefing to Your Honor. At this point, you know, we've also obtained at least one of the contracts of the applicants that puts a more recent market value of the spectrum at issue in this case. And it's actually that spectrum is only four of 71 licenses.

If you take the most liberal, lowest cost price that Maritime has put on that spectrum, which is .35 cents per megahertz per population, the value of just four of the licenses is estimated somewhere approximately

about \$63 million, at a minimum, and at a 1 maximum could be as high as \$85 million, so 2 nearly four times the amount that would be owed 3 to innocent creditors. 4 So it's the Bureau's position that, 5 regardless of whether we have a Second Thursday 6 analysis, and those innocent creditors are 7 satisfied through that process, that there will 8 be an extensive value of licenses left over 9 that, by necessity, must be determined through 10 this hearing process. 11 And so there's no purpose for staying 12 the hearing, when inevitably, we will be here in 13 14 any case. JUDGE SIPPEL: Let me see if I 15 understand exactly what you're saying. 16 saying that there has to be a determination, 17 now, now what about the, without getting into 18 19 the precise merits of the case, that it's a false and misleading filing, et cetera. 20 But before we even stop this case 21 from going forward, for consideration of Second 22

1	Thursday, there has to be a value placed on, in
2	other words, it has to be a realistic appraisal
3	of the ability of Maritime to actually fulfill
4	the obligations of one of the key conditions of
5	Second Thursday, which is, for the purpose of
6	making creditors whole, you have to have a
7	realistic amount of money.
8	MS. KANE: We would agree with that,
9	Your Honor. And, frankly, we've been raising
10	this issue and, you know, through discovery, we
11	had hoped to learn, at least, what the value of
12	the contracts were that are already outstanding
13	between Maritime and the applicants.
14	We know one of those contracts is \$7
15	million, because the Metrolink SCRRA has
16	provided that contract.
17	Maritime has not provided any of the
18	other contracts, and, you know, for all we know,
19	the value of those contracts alone exceeds the
20	value that's owed to the innocent creditors.
21	And
	T. Control of the Con

JUDGE SIPPEL: So your question is

that what happens to the balance? 1 2 MS. KANE: Yes, our question is what happens to the balance. And all we've ever 3 heard from Maritime, is that they intend to 4 transfer it as a restructuring of the company to 5 6 some independent third party. But it's our position, Your Honor, 7 that, once they satisfy the innocent creditors, 8 9 any further transactions are precluded by the long-standing Jefferson Radio policy. In other 10 words, they can't use --11 12 JUDGE SIPPEL: I just didn't know --13 no, go ahead. MS. KANE: They can't use Second 14 Thursday as a way to evade this hearing for the 15 transactions for licenses that are not necessary 16 to satisfy innocent creditors. 17 18 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Let me hear --I'm going, Mr. McFadden, I'm going to get to you 19 on this in just a minute. Let me hear, I'm 20 21 interested in Mr. Keller's response to the last 22 point that Ms. Kane made. What happens to the